

8. The Question of the State: "The Workers Have No Country"

To all who study the movement, revolutionary syndicalism is synonymous with two characteristics: direct action and antistatism. As noted in the second chapter, direct action was most consistently defined as apolitical and antigovernmental action. Electoral activity was regarded as a snare and a delusion, dulling the workers' revolutionary commitment and supporting a government of class bent only on the workers' exploitation. Direct action was advocated as a means by which the workers themselves could overthrow the oppressive class and its state. In that sense, antipatriotism and antimilitarism were expressed in forms of direct action having the same aim. Increasingly these two tactics, really one, came to compete in importance with the general strike. Together the two were regarded as being the most radical activities at the workers' disposal. It was not until 1900 that the FBT and the CGT took up the discussion of militarism. But beginning in 1904, antimilitarism was on the agenda of every CGT congress until the war.

Yet, despite the importance of antimilitarism and the years of antiwar propaganda carried on by the syndicalist movement, when the war came syndicalist leaders did not declare the general strike. Workers did not revolt, they mobilized. Notwithstanding the strongly antipatriotic stance taken by the workers' movement, the majority of unionists supported the Union sacrée. Critics consequently have charged that syndicalist actions in response to the war serve to indicate the impotence of the movement and its leaders, demonstrated in the inability to put into practice what it had for so long preached. CGT leaders have been assailed as demagogues, preaching violent overthrow of the government, but cowering under their blankets when the time came to take action. The antipatriotic, insurrectional talk had been only "a soufflé," Georges Dumoulin claimed.(1) Lacking substance, syndicalist propaganda never had penetrated the masses, who remained patriotic reactionaries and willing dupes of the capitalist imperialist government.

To assess these charges it is necessary to examine the

nature of syndicalism's antipatriotic and antimilitarist posture and the movement's response to the war. By analyzing the attitudes of the working class to the "patrie," it becomes clear that as a result of economic pressure and under the influence of revolutionary doctrines, the workers' concept of the fatherland changed from a metaphysical symbol identified with an historical patrimony, to something concrete: an economic-political state and the source of material well-being under the control of the middle class. But bourgeois control was regarded as temporary; therefore revolutionary activity was directed toward capturing the state from the class enemy. Antimilitarist sentiments and activity must also be assessed. For syndicalists the use of antimilitarist propaganda was clearly another form of direct action. Antimilitary activity was revolutionary in that it was directed to the overthrow of the exploitative state. Syndicalism's antimilitarist program was also practically aimed at building unionism. It was used to stifle reformist voices within the ranks; it served as an effective instrument in the rural offensive; and it offered a *modus vivendi* between the competing theories of Marx and Proudhon and between syndicalists and party socialists.

Finally, to understand anarchosyndicalism's attitude toward the state, a brief look at syndicalist activity during the war is in order. The conclusion drawn is that this response did not constitute a failure of nerve and that neither the leaders nor the movement was impotent. Revolutionary propaganda had penetrated the masses. Largely due to syndicalist activity the French worker in the years before the war had come to regard the existing state as an entity in the process of transformation, moving as a result of working-class pressure toward its ultimate form: a regime of economic liberty and equality. It was this patrie, with its potential of ultimate social revolution, that had to be protected against German barbarism. Given these perceptions by the working class, anything contributing to the nation's defeat constituted an antirevolutionary act. Under the circumstances, a call for the general strike on the eve of mobilization would have been regarded as a utopian action. Instead, as will be demonstrated, syndicalism's response to mobilization and war was consistent with its definition of revolutionary action: the practical response to possibilities inherent in the present.

THE INDISPENSABLE WORKERS' REPUBLIC

Antistatism was part of the revolutionary posture of Marx and Proudhon. In the Manifesto, Marx and Engels had declared that workers had no country, that class transcended national frontiers. Proudhon's indictment of the state and its government was based on his perception that the state was force imposed on the individual. French radicals in the First International were anarchist followers of Bakunin and

Proudhon. Those who formed the nucleus of the early labor movement were the Communards, for whom not even government amnesty could wipe out the memory of the mur des fédérés. The inheritance of French militancy was one in which the nation state was synonymous with force and the object of working-class conquest.

Despite the antistatist inheritance, there was an early tendency among French workers to regard the patrie as being the vehicle for achieving economic reform. They were supported in their attitude by the policies of the government during its Opportunist stage, when efforts were made to turn the working class into a bulwark of the Third Republic. Workers frequently regarded themselves as "the sons of the Social Contract," believing they had earned their right to well-being because it was part of their patrimony, given them by their forefathers, who had fought in the wars of national defense.(2) Striking workers in Marseille in 1886 protested against the use of foreign labor with stirring patriotic appeals: "You let the French die of famine to favor those who have hatred for the Patrie," their placards read. Many workers regarded the state as a force for justice, a mediator between employer and worker in the interest of protecting republican order. Having shared in the triumph of the Republic, workers believed they would share in its benefits.(3)

The strikes of 1878 to 1880, notes Michelle Perrot, were usually demonstrations of "republican hope." Strikers generally seeking state intervention wrote letters, drafted petitions, and even sent bouquets to the magistrates. In 1890 a group of striking weavers in Roanne appealed to the municipal authorities to settle the strike, stating that because the sub-prefect--apparently the one in charge of the negotiations--was a republican, he could be trusted. During workers' demonstrations the "Carmagnole" and the "Marseillaise" were often sung. Patriotism was also a strong mitigating force against strikes as well. Higher wages would make French goods noncompetitive; social disturbances would make France vulnerable to her neighbors: these were the themes.(4) The eight-hour day would come when France manufactured in eight hours what it previously took twelve hours to produce, explained a member of L'Union Prolétarienne. But workers must wait until such time as they could compete effectively with Germany and England, two nations possessing superior technology.(5) The feeling that strikes were treasonous helped to contribute to the relatively peaceful nature of working-class activity before 1880.(6)

Even among the early syndicalists and socialists there was a tendency to support the Republic. Fernand Pelloutier remained a nationalist and a republican even after his conversion to anarchism, Jacques Julliard points out, because Pelloutier believed the Republic was the only milieu in which socialism could triumph.(7) Gustave Hervé, l'enfant terrible of antimilitarism, who wrote under the name "Sans Patrie," had a peculiar attitude toward the Republic. The

early articles written in his Pioupiau de l'Yonne were both pacifist and patriotic, urging conscripts always to defend the republican patrie against foreign aggression.(8) Members of the bourse remained similarly hopeful of the benefits of republicanism, although this was the only course they could follow perhaps, given the juridic nature of their existence. At the 1893 inauguration of the Nîmes bourse, tailor Victorien Bruguiere declared that it would be "a feather in the republican hat" if the state would grant such reforms as were generally "prescribed by a monarchy." Workers must remember that "the best of legislations concerning workers [would] remain a dead letter so long as there was no state to execute them." The role of the bourse, as envisioned by Bruguiere, was that of handmaiden to the state: it would serve the workers as the Chamber of Commerce served the employers.(9)

The preservation of the Republic was a common theme in the early stages of the workers' movement. In 1898 a report at the Rennes congress of the CGT warned workers to remain aloof in the Dreyfus affair. "Cosmopolitan Jewry" and "clerical financiers" were working within the bowels of the government to sap the Republic's strength. The manifesto sounded the alarm:

WORKERS!

The Republic, indispensable principle of future social emancipation, is in danger.

SOCIALIST REVOLUTIONARIES!

Recall the memorable dates of 1793, 1830, 1848, 1871; be ready to defend the Republic and conquer our independence.

SOLDIERS!

Don't forget you are the sons of workers; that tomorrow, in leaving the so-called national army, you return to the universal army of the Proletariat.

PROLETARIAT!

The Republican army has no other rights than to defend the menaced liberty.

LONG LIVE THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION!(10)

Part of the reason for workers' passivity was that in the early years, the power of the state had been sheathed against them. In the 1882 strike at Montceau-les-Mines, soldiers sent in to maintain order were perhaps relieved to be coopted by labor's propaganda. The soldiers were treated at the local café by the striking workers. Soon, not only were the officers fraternizing with the striking workers, but the enlisted men were also making professions of lasting kinship with their officers!(11) An important reason for the changing climate of working-class opinion toward the

republican state was the increasing use of government force. In 1888 striking excavation workers at Corrèze experienced the government's wrath in a violent confrontation, which left six women mortally wounded and many injured. May Day of 1890 brought on a "virtual mobilization" of government forces, according to Perrot, although the Paris demonstrations were relatively peaceful.(12) By the following year, Perrot notes, workers no longer harbored the illusion of a benign republicanism.(13)

STATE AGAINST PATRIE

Government repression of labor did not happen in a vacuum. It was also helped along by the entrance of Blanquists and anarchists into the labor movement. Militancy did not happen in a vacuum either. Much of the détente between workers and the state was the result of the confusion within the left over the question of revolutionary means. The schism between political and economic socialists helped to clear up the confusion. Needing to win elections, the party socialists muted their antistatism.(14) This allowed the syndicalists to assume a more radical posture in calling for the overthrow of the state. In addition, the Dreyfus affair exposed the corruption of both the military and the state. Responding to all of these factors--anarchist militancy, socialist "opportunism," and government repression--revolutionary syndicalism moved away from the traditional posture of regarding the state as mediator in workers' conflicts and donned the mantle of Marxist-Proudhonist militant antistatism.

A good deal of printers' ink was spent by labor to support Proudhon's contention that the bourgeois state was immoral, unjust, and unnecessary. In a 1904 article in La Voix du Peuple, Maurice Travaux railed against the vote in parliament to increase the naval budget. What is the patrie, asked Travaux: "It is pillage, theft, and assassination to glorify war."(15) The state was a modern fiction, according to Paul Louis in 1910. The Republic was only seventy-five years old, yet the economic revolution was posterior to the French Revolution. It was apparent to Louis that democracy was impotent in the face of its inability to achieve political equality in a society based on economic inequality.(16)

To anarchosyndicalists the patrie was an economic entity in which only producers could be citizens. This conception was apparent to St. Cyr professor of Ethics, Jean Taboreau, in 1912. The notion of the fatherland was different for the worker than it was for the middle class. Workers did not understand the arts and literature of their country, which was their patrimony as citizens. Nor could they identify the nation with their natal ground, since workers typically had to leave their birthplaces to find work elsewhere. The position of the proletariat, Taboreau noted, was that it had no country because it owned nothing.

To defend the soil, therefore, would be to defend the soil of the possessing class.(17) Georges Yvetot bore out this observation in a 1913 article in La Voix du Peuple. The patrie, he said, "is our work [that] we do, the thoughts we think, that which elevates us, and all revolt against arbitrariness and tyranny."(18)

The equation of the fatherland with economic well-being and revolution was a constant theme in syndicalist literature. In 1908 the delegates to the CGT congress discussed patriotism. The convention followed in the wake of the use of martial force against the striking workers at Villeneuve-Saint-Georges. Recalling the words of the Manifesto, the resolution concluded with the reminder that the workers had no country.(19) At the 1907 regional meeting of the Auxerre bourse du travail delegate Ballin pointed out that patriotism was aimed at conserving the actual state of things in society. In France the good patriot was a Republican, and the antipatriot was the one aspiring for a better society.(20)

Socialists had only one country, declared Hervé, "the international Socialist Republic of their dreams; they have some compatriots: the socialists, the exploited, the oppressed, the rebellious of the entire world." That the bourgeois would love their country was natural, Hervé told the jurors during his 1905 trial for antimilitarist activity:

For you and yours, the patrie is a good mother; she pampers you when you are infants; she gives you good instruction; she makes happy moments for you; she assures you of considerable work, well-paid; of long vacations, future security tomorrow and for your old age.

You would be monsters of ingratitude, unnatural sons, if you were not ready to come to her defense when she calls.

But for the workers, concluded Hervé, the country is "a stepmother, a vixen who despises us."(21) "Vulgus" said it more succinctly in a 1905 article in La Guerre Sociale: "The rich have a country, the poor do not."(22)

Based as it was on economic exploitation and class domination, the state was a pernicious force hindering the growth of solidarity and encouraging murderous sentiments within the human heart. Delegates to the 1901 congress of the FBT agreed that the idea of the fatherland was a false principle. It had become "the pretext for periodic killings of men without hatred for one another."(23) The state sent its citizens to Madagascar, Tonkin, and China to exploit people in order to keep commerce wealthy and missionaries happily employed in soul saving, Hervé charged.(24) Visiting German delegate Joh von Sassenbach, speaking before the 1912 CGT congress at Le Havre, called for class unity. Workers knew very well that it would be foolish "to love the oppressing classes" of their own countries more than their

"brothers in labor from the other side of the frontier." (25)

The word "patrie," wrote Yvetot in the Nouveau manuel du soldat in 1902, had been used to create illusions among their parents and grandparents that were transmitted to the present generation. "It is one of the words which are the most colored in human blood." Mothers rocked their babies to sleep singing patriotic songs; fathers amused their children with war stories; the first toys given a child were guns, flags, and soldiers. At school and in church, children were educated in the love of their country. But instead of wanting to develop human instincts, the state sought to instill in the human heart the brutal feelings of the warrior and murderer. (26) Why was this so? Amédée Bousquet at the 1910 CGT congress knew it was because their "government of stupid asses" was in constant fear of losing its power. (27)

As an instrument of the capitalist ruling class, the fatherland stood for repression of the French themselves. The patrie, asserted Victor Griffuelhes, "is that which gives me not enough to eat." (28) It is "the state incarnate," declared Dumoulin, whose centralization opposed "the free development of producers and consumers." (29) Patrie, concluded Yvetot, was "the meaningless words on the placards when candidates promise [us] the same reforms they promised our fathers and their fathers." (30) To Travaux the fatherland was the factory where workers passed their lives "joylessly and without profit, the barracks which raise our sons, the hospitals where we die, and the brothel where we take our daughters." Republicans liked to symbolize the patrie as having the traits of a Roman matron--an "antique Minerva," he concluded. But to us "she is like the modern version of the bloody Indian idol Kali." (31) Some syndicalists might preach reform of the state. Not Dumoulin. In 1913 he proclaimed: "I don't want to reinforce it, nor reform it, nor conquer it; I want to destroy it." (32)

ANTIMILITARISM AND THE CAMPAIGN FOR CONTROL OF THE YOUNG

Since anarchosyndicalists regarded the fatherland as being based on class domination, they were also opposed to the army upon which the state rested. Antimilitary sentiments had deep roots in French society. The peasants hated the army, as has been noted. Workers, too, harbored long-standing grudges against the military because soldiers traditionally had carried on some kind of productive activity in their spare time. Early workers' congresses usually called for suppression of all work in barracks, prisons, and convents because of the competition from these people "moonlighting" in their free time. (33) To these ongoing reasons for antimilitarist resentment were added others: the anarchists' aversion to any instrument of force, the republican government's growing commitment to put down workers' militancy, the disintegration of the

balance-of-power state system, and escalating world tensions. The earliest antimilitarist activities were inspired by a desire to spread unionism and to safeguard the moral health of the working class.

As a result of the French defeat in the Franco-Prussian War, in 1873 the government instituted universal military training. For twenty years the army was popular with the public as a whole. But in the midst of a period of chauvinism and a desire for revenge, of which Boulangism was a symptom, a growing disenchantment with militarism began to occur. Antimilitarist sentiment was recorded first in literature. Several important novels were written: Le cavalier mis rier and Sous l'off', published in 1887, followed by Abel Hermant. These novels took as their theme the moral debasement of army life.(34) These literary works both reflected and helped to effect a changing attitude toward the military. Later the Dreyfus affair further nudged along antimilitarist sentiments.

The Catholic church was the first to respond to the issue of moral decay. Seeking to counter the allegedly brutalizing effects of army life on the young, the church established Catholic Circles to maintain contact with the young recruits. When a young conscript left for the army, the parish priest gave him a letter of introduction to the regimental chaplain or alerted a priest in the town where the new recruit would be stationed. The church also provided the conscript with prayer books, pamphlets, and manuals designed to sustain the young Christian in his faith and provide him with some guidance on how to live a moral life. Members of the Catholic Circles invited young soldiers to their homes for dinner, and for religious study, devotional exercises, or good Christian fun. If propaganda were not enough, the church also established a "Sou du soldat," paid for by parishioners, to provide the young soldier with a small honorarium, which might be used to buy special treats or to place in the collection plate on Sunday.(35) The church's goal was undoubtedly threefold: to sustain religious commitment among young men during a critical period of their lives when delights of the flesh rather than of the spirit beckoned; to preserve the soldiers' souls from too many mortal sins; and to do battle against the state--three years of army life was enough to indoctrinate young men with the tenets of anticlerical republicanism.

Syndicalism's aims for the young recruits paralleled that of the church's: to preserve the moral health of the youngster, the future worker; to dilute the state's influence on him; and to educate the young recruit to the goals of syndicalism and the class struggle. Regarding themselves in combat with the church for control of the young, syndicalists proceeded to adopt the church's tactics in the early stages of their antimilitarist campaign.

As was the case with so many other campaigns, it was the members of the bourses who provided the impetus for the antimilitarist offensive. At the FBT congress held in Paris

in 1900, an important item on the agenda was the relationship of the bourse to the worker-soldiers. The delegate from Nîmes noted that young men going into the service generally forgot about the unions in which they had spent so little time before conscription. He suggested that the syndicats give these recruits the opportunity to continue their professional education and defend them against the religious societies that were constantly proselytizing. The delegate from Tours was shocked that militants would consider imitating the congregations. Instead, he suggested, they should invite soldiers to join the young socialist organizations in the area. The resolution following the discussion called for bourse members to work actively to place young recruits from their locales in contact with the bourses secretaries in the area near the military garrisons. (36)

At the CGT meeting following the FBT congress that year, the antimilitarist question also appeared on the agenda. Again it was suggested that the unions take a leaf from the Catholics' book. Before a soldier left his parish, noted Vilde, he was given a letter putting him in touch with the chaplain of the regiment. The workers' organizations should do the same thing. Sanitation worker Jean-Baptiste Sémanaz suggested that before they were inducted, soldiers who were union members might be given a three- or four-franc "subsidy." Meyer of the culinary workers thought five or ten francs for "trinkets" might be more effective. "It would have a good effect on the comrades who are ignorant of the syndicalist idea," he declared, and would be good propaganda among the soldiers of the entire regiment. Edouard Briat suggested that the five or six thousand men drafted annually should be called together by the unions before their departure to the garrisons and be apprised of their rights.

The resolution following the discussion was the beginning of unionism's official antimilitarist campaign, to be aimed at the class of 1900. It called for the organization of public meetings for the inductees. It voted to send subsidies, in other words, a Sou du soldat, to reach the young soldiers through the intermediaries of the bourse or union secretaries in the garrison towns. The resolution called for the invitation of the young draftees to "familial festivals" organized in the towns in which they were stationed. (37) The following year, at the behest of the FBT delegates convened at Algeria, the CGT launched the more radical phase of its antimilitarist campaign. A Manuel du soldat was commissioned to be printed and circulated among the military. The propaganda piece--clearly inflammatory in nature--was also to be sold to the civilian population as a way to enhance the Sou's treasury. (38)

In 1902 delegates to the FBT congress called for the publication of another antimilitarist brochure and encouraged all their member organizations to carry out extensive antimilitarist propaganda. The resolution that year, however, did grant full autonomy to each bourse in determining the form and content of its particular

campaign.(39) The same year La Voix du Peuple took notice of the departure of the class of 1902 by reporting on the party organized by the Union des Syndicats de la Seine for the recruits. The party included dancing, elocutions, and orchestral performances. The aim of the affair had been to provide "a living reminder of solidarity" for the young men going to the barracks.(40)

The same paper carried another article mentioning that the editors had compiled a pamphlet for circulation among the military and urged the unions to use it. The gist of the message was that the soldiers should seek out a family of workers in their garrison cities to provide them with an acceptable familial relationship. They should visit the unions and the bourses, where they would be furnished with paper, stamps, professional courses, meetings, and lending libraries. The unionized soldiers should also invite their nonunion comrades to accompany them, since their friends would be treated hospitably and would want to return. The pamphlet closed with the injunction: "Remember what you were before being in the regiment. Dream of what you will be when you leave it."(41) In the following issue, an editorial called for the continued circulation of brochures in the barracks and propaganda visits to be carried out by union members.(42) Another notice reminded conscripts to get from their locals the names and addresses of comrades in the cities where they would be stationed.(43)

Delegates to the 1910 congress made the same appeals.(44) At the next congress at Le Havre in 1912, a Committee of the Bourses entered into the records another call directing soldiers' attention to the fact that they were welcome in the bourses, unions, and the maisons du peuple, and expressed hope that such visits would become more numerous. At the same congress some delegates spoke of the need for early antimilitarist education. Rimont of Bordeaux suggested that one could not ignore such training and then expect one's son to become an antimilitarist at the age of twenty. Delegates could no longer just "speak through their teeth" about militarism, he concluded; they must be committed to making propaganda at home as well as in their unions.(45)

In the years before the war, these devices constituted the basic tactics used by syndicalists in their campaign toward the military. It was a program, on the surface at least, benign in its intent, aimed as it was at neutralizing the church and the state's overtures, recruiting the young draftees to unionism, and protecting their moral health while serving in the military.

"A SCHOOL OF CRIME"

Stemming from the same literary milieu, and having adopted the same tactics as the Catholic church, not surprisingly, syndicalism's antimilitarist message had strong moral overtones. The unions had long campaigned to

outlaw military moonlighting. Ultimately they were successful. Now it seemed that soldiers had too much time to waste. During their years of inactivity young men lost their productive tendencies, syndicalists charged. They became either mindless robots or murderous brutes in thrall to their commanders. To escape boredom they too often gave themselves over to a desultory life.

A delegate to the 1901 FBT congress stated that military service physically and morally corrupted young people who were brought "into the place of vice and idiotic discipline they call the barracks." (46) In 1912 Bousquet charged that young soldiers were sent "to unspeakable places, where they encounter pederasty and all the vices." (47) Boucher de Perthes, writing in Le Libertaire in 1904, suggested that the single life of the barracks was demoralizing. Those years of "fickle love" rendered the soldier "incapable of the faithful love and domestic joys" awaiting him in the bosom of his family. (48) It was not just working-class spokesmen who pointed out the horrors of army life. In his Manuel Yvetot was able to marshal numerous testimonials, even by the bourgeoisie. Three-time Minister of War Freycinet had stated that since soldiers had so little to do, "they were receptive to all occasions for debauchery which the big cities offered." Edouard Drumont, rightist editor of the Libre Parole, declared that all recruits came back with syphilis, while conservative Deputy Jules Delafasse concluded that military service brought the majority of the young to sterility, a national threat in the era of a German population explosion. (49)

Worse, perhaps, than heightening the taste for sexual perversion was the fact that military service encouraged laziness. Delegate Granier of the Béziers bourse suggested at the 1900 CGT congress that syndicalists should provide professional courses for young soldiers during their enlistment so they would return home "with a good and sane notion of work." (50) Soldiers were parasites during their time in the military because they were nonproducers, declared Boucher de Perthes. The soldier's father and brother had to work for two while the young man was in the army. This placed as great a strain on the family as having to support one of its members during a long apprenticeship. The only difference was that when a young man returned home from the army, he had neither skills nor a desire to work. (51) Also gone was his independent spirit. In the barracks one learned "to obey the most idiotic, contradictory, immoral orders," noted Yvetot. And if the soldier refused, the firing squad was the reward for his "gesture of dignity." (52)

In 1912 delegates to the Le Havre congress heard numerous protests against the passage of the infamous Berry-Millerand Law which assigned stiff penalties against soldiers for anti-militarist agitation, insubordination, and radicalism. For any of these crimes the soldier was consigned to duty with the Foreign Legion, the terrible "Batt' d'Afr'" in Algeria. Delegate Bousquet made a lengthy

appeal for workers to protest this law, based on the fact that military service drained the soldier of his abilities to produce.

Mothers, you who have nursed your infant to the strains of an ancient song, and you fathers, who return from your labor, passing your hand over the golden tresses of your child, whose simple smile comforts you, you who have sacrificed for him, you who have seen him grow, you other fathers and mothers who count on your child to help you when he reaches the age of twenty: they want to raise him for the eternal military carnival; they dress him in blue and red and make him fill the role of servant, of flunky. More serious, they make him forget his comrades in the workshop. They emasculate him of all his manly energies. They make of him a passive being, an inert being, without a conscience, like the flywheel on some kind of machine. They have inculcated in him the principles of passivity and obedience, and when they have sounded the quarry on the workers' backs, they will have made of him a soldier, a brute, an instrument of capitalists. One sees, oh abnormal spectacle, the capitalist class strong enough to defend its privileges through the people's children, dressed as soldiers.

The government was aware that in the barracks the young man became "a human tatter." Fathers must protest this dehumanization. Mothers must join the revolt. Recalling Roman history and the example of the Sabine women who threw themselves among the combatants, Bousquet called upon mothers to resist the continuation of this criminal practice: universal conscription. (53)

Appeals to women were a common device in the antimilitarist campaign. In his 1903 article in La Voix du Peuple, Amédée Bousquet again called upon women to join the antimilitarist legions. It was the mother who allowed her little boy to play with military toys. It was she who had unwittingly awakened in her son "feelings of murder and prepared him for the barracks." Mothers must teach their young "to hate war and to despise the military profession." Then when the rulers tried to claim their boys for their "school of crime," the mothers of France would show who was speaking. (54)

In his trial for antimilitarist activity in 1905, Gustave Hervé used the occasion to appeal above the heads of the jury to the mothers of France, who regardless of class, were united in their desire to keep their sons from being killed on the battlefield. If he were silenced in his antimilitary campaign, and a war should come, Hervé warned the jury, sons would fall "in the flower of their youth." Then they, the jury, would have to face the mothers, who

would remind them that the antimilitarists were courageous men who had shown a way to prevent governments from "unleashing war or massacring [their sons], and you misérables had [them] thrown in prison." Hervé's defense was so stirring that it brought "loud and repeated" applause from the audience, causing the presiding judge to threaten to clear the room.(55)

Military service not only emasculated the worker-soldier, syndicalists claimed, it also brutalized him. In his "Conseils de famille," railroad worker Paul Fribourg declared in 1902 that the soldier learned the métier of the brute, and that the best soldier was "a machine for killing."(56) Boucher de Perthes expanded upon the theme of brutalization. In the barracks young men learned to destroy, not create. That the government needed to teach destruction was an indication of the full extent of its corruption.(57) A constant refrain was that when men left the service they could only become policemen, working to control the proletariat, or jaunes, replacing striking workers. A cartoon appearing in one of the antimilitarist issues of La Voix du Peuple graphically illustrated this charge. In it was an obviously debauched, imbecilic-looking young man lurching from the gates of the army post. An equally dissolute captain asked the departing wretch: "What are you going to do, now that you're free and have lost the habit of working?" The departing soldier's answer was: "Get a job as a cop so I can continue to live at the expense of others."(58)

THE MANUEL AND THE SOU DU SOLDAT

Along with making direct contact with the recruits, syndicalists continued to publish and circulate the Manuel du soldat. By 1904, 20,000 of these pamphlets had been distributed among the military and another 100,000 had been commissioned by the CGT. In 1906 Amiens delegates heard the report by Yvetot that over 200,000 Manuels had been sold. By 1908 the Manuel was in its sixteenth printing and had 185,000 subscribers. In addition, another 20,000 brochures of extracts from the Manuel were in circulation. The nature of the work, combined with its successful circulation, earned Yvetot--himself the son of a policeman--numerous prison sentences.(59)

Less clearly successful was the device of the Sou du soldat, although propaganda in support of this technique continued to remain intense. In 1902 an article in La Voix du Peuple urged workers to support the fund. The sons of the bourgeoisie endured military service much better than the workers' sons, the writer noted. Middle class youths were treated less harshly by their commanders. Generally they had business or family contacts in towns near the barracks. Because they always had pocket money, they could rent their own private quarters or have fun when they were not on duty. It should no longer be the case that workers'

children must be confined to the barracks because they had neither contacts nor money. Alone and isolated, the young soldiers could too easily fall prey to the priests, who encouraged them to join the church, or the jaunes--that "hermaphrodite of the class." The Sou would provide the children of the poor with the same pleasures that middle-class sons enjoyed. It would furnish a monthly pension and further stimulate amicable relations between the soldiers and the local unionists.(60) In the 1903 edition of the Manuel, recruits were urged to accept the Sou, not to purchase alcohol, but as "a fraternal pledge of sympathy" uniting them with the comrades they had left behind.(61)

In 1912 La Voix du Peuple again appealed for funds. The Sou, noted the article, "comforts the slave who submits to the outrages of the galley; permits him to reflect on the role he is to play, and [allows him] to remain a man conscious of his acts and will." Young soldiers needed to be made aware that upon their discharge, they would join the ranks of the exploited. They must realize that if they carried out "a fratricidal gesture" while they were in the army, they would be working against their own emancipation. The Sou allowed the young soldiers to group into organizations they themselves had formed. In these groups the soldier-workers could talk freely, receive journals, and find "the moral comfort" needed after submitting to the brutalities and vexations of military life. Surely, concluded the article, the Sou might be considered as a downpayment on the future in that it worked to destroy useless militarism.(62)

How effectively workers supported or recruits took advantage of the fund is difficult to say, since there appears to have been no official accounting made of the treasury. By 1911, however, the Sûreté Générale--the state's criminal investigations department--regarded the plan as being successful, and noted that there had been good response by workers to Yvetot's appeals. The Sûreté stated in its reports that bourses and unions in numerous cities had Sou treasuries.(63) Still, the fund appears always to have suffered from a paucity of contributions, at least in the early stages. In 1902 La Voix du Peuple noted that perhaps raffle tickets might be sold to augment the treasury.(64) Delegates to the Amiens congress heard that the plan was not working well because of parochial concerns. There had been a suggestion that the Confederal Committee appoint a central organization to administer the fund; this plan was rejected. Local unions had built up their treasuries in order to aid their own hometown boys. Further, it was feared that a single bureau might not spend the money so wisely as all might wish. Also, many were afraid that a central administrative body might keep records too faithfully: those dossiers might be published, to the detriment of the contributors who could be prosecuted for antimilitarist activity.(65)

Subsequently this is precisely what happened. In March 1914 the government outlawed the Sou, much to the disgust of

the editors of La Voix du Peuple, who charged that this action represented an example of injustice and government repression. Unionists regarded the Sou "as an act of solidarity, considered by the syndical organizations as being an absolute duty and right," the article declared. Catholics continued their program without any government restrictions; syndicalists' demanded to be allowed to continue their work equally unhampered.(66)

"EPOCH OF BAYONETS"

Antimilitarist activity in the early stages of syndicalism was regarded as an appropriate form of direct action, that is, a positive activity carried on within the military designed to spread unionism and heighten morality. As the army was used increasingly against the workers themselves, syndicalist attitudes toward the military and the state hardened. In 1910 Amédée Bousquet, the secretary of the Foodworkers' Federation, recounted for the delegates of the CGT how, as a soldier in 1891, he had been forced to bake bread during the Parisian bakers' strike.(67) At the next congress, Bousquet noted again how his union was victimized by the army: bakers could not make a move without having soldiers sent in to replace them.(68)

Any workers' demonstration was threatened by the government's employment of troops. In the first May Day celebration in 1890, organized under the auspices of the Guesdists and supported by all the militants, massive numbers of troops were sent into Paris. The night before May 1, the major streets of Rivoli, Royale, Saint-Honoré, and Opéra were covered with a layer of fine gravel in order to mount a cavalry charge against the demonstrators. Troops were stationed in the basement of the Church of the Madeleine and in the train depots to prevent workers from flocking into the city. No violence occurred that day. But the government's demonstration of military might seemed to be a case of overkill, since the Guesdists' stated purpose for the May Day demonstrations was to present a petition to the Chamber.(69)

In the first years of the decade it seemed that the army would remain a benign, if annoying, force. Numerous examples of the military's support of the workers were cited. Soldiers had refused to march against the striking workers at Le Creusot. With increased propaganda by the militants, Louis Grandidier explained, the troops would soon become soldiers of the Revolution."(70) At the 1900 congress of the CGT, Briat was optimistic about the effects of antimilitarist propaganda. The regiment at Châlon-sur-Saône had refused to march against strikers. Troops in another strike were ordered by their sergeant to fire into the air and then let the workers pass.(71) The day was not too far off, declared Fribourg, when the army would throw its "instruments of massacre in the air and cry 'Vive la révolution sociale!'"(72)

Antimilitarist propaganda in the early years constantly enjoined soldiers to refuse to use force against their comrades." Because the army was composed of proletarians, stated a 1900 resolution of the CGT, it must remain aloof from labor disputes.(73) In his Manuel Yvetot urged young men to refuse to obey if their officers were going to make murderers of them. If sent into a strike, he said, "DO NOT FIRE! . . . Do not kill your brothers!"(74) In an open letter to a friend leaving for the service, anarchist Fred Pol offered a double enjoiner. In the event that the soldier might be called upon to use force against workers, Pol urged: "don't fire, my brother, or else--aim straight."(75)

As working-class militancy heightened, so too did government opposition, particularly as Clemenceau, "the strike breaker," gained increasing power within the government. After long years in eclipse as a viable means of publicizing workers' demands, the May Day demonstration experienced a resurgence of life in 1903. That year Hervé had been instrumental in organizing demonstrations against government intervention in the Russo-Japanese War. Seeing the potential of this tactic, the CGT linked May Day with its campaign for the eight-hour day. From 1903 to 1906, strikes in support of the eight-hour day quadrupled in number, according to the French Bureau of Labor Statistics.(76)

Concurrent with these strikes were the CGT-organized May Day demonstrations. Throughout 1904 May Day propaganda saturated the country. Over 150,000 May Day brochures were sold by the syndicalists that year. A song about May Day as the symbol of the struggle for the eight-hour day, set to the music of the "Internationale" and offered for one sou, sold over 400,000 copies. Posters announcing the demonstration and the demand were printed. La Voix du Peuple urged workers to "Stick them up all over. Yes, all over . . . It is necessary that it become an obsession." Ultimately walls, fences, even café tables throughout France were plastered with over six million placards. The CGT campaign brought results, according to Maurice Dommanget, who made a study of May Day. By 1906 "a psychosis for the eight-hour day" had been created. In Béziers 15,000 fieldworkers paraded on the first of May. That day 40,000 were in the streets of Saint-Etienne. Factories throughout the country had to be closed. Two-thirds of the arsenal workers in Toulouse staged a one-day walkout. Declaring the demonstrations to be part of a "monarcho-anarchosyndicalist plot," the government of Sarrien-Clemenceau took extreme measures. Provincial bourses were closed. Fifty to sixty thousand troops were dispatched to Paris to keep order. All over France there were arrests, violence, and casualties. Once in power Clemenceau, the "number one cop," made certain that no similar show of force would take place. May Day of 1907 saw Paris again like an armed camp. The following year militants were so cowed by the government that Hervé disgustedly noted that not a single red flag was in

evidence. In 1909, a year of high unemployment, Clemenceau again dispatched 20,000 troops to Paris to discourage any worker militancy. Demonstrations were squelched and the workers had to content themselves with issuing manifestos.(77) *

The Clemenceau years of 1906 to 1909 were also years of strikes and shootings. The army intervened in the strike of shoeworkers at Raon-l'Etape, leaving two dead. In 1908 troops fired into a crowd of striking excavation workers at Draveil and workers at Vigneaux and Villeneuve-Saint-Georges. In 1907 the casualty list among strikers totaled 9 dead and 167 wounded. In 1908 it was 10 dead and between 500 and 600 wounded.(78) To match the government's get-tough policy, syndicalism's antimilitarist campaign became increasingly radical, a fact that disturbed many in the CGT. Proponents of using extreme tactics soon found they had to defend themselves against members of their own rank-and-file with almost as much vigor as shown against the government.

One important reason for the aversion by some unionists to the adoption of a strong antimilitarist posture was the tendency on the part of the anarchists to preach desertion as a noble alternative to induction. At the 1901 Lyon congress of the CGT the decision was made to use the treasury of the Sou du soldat to aid draft resisters.(79) Many unionists believed that it was dangerous enough to assist conscientious objectors; it was quite another thing to preach desertion! This was clearly an option offered recruits in Yvetot's Manuel. Young men, it declared,

If you think you cannot support the vexation, the insult, the imbecilities, the punishments and all the turpitude that awaits you in the army: DESERT! That would be better than serving at the amusement of the alcoholics' bureau, and for those insane fools who take control of you beyond your power in the military prisons.(80)

In 1902, the year when the syndicalists agreed to publish the Manuel, an article appeared in Le Libertaire penned by Pierre Monatte, which provided the anarchists' ethical stance for desertion. The government imprisoned soldiers in body and spirit. To escape that prison, and out of the felt need "to conserve moral propriety as a man," anarchists deserted from the army. Desertion was another form of propaganda by the deed, Monatte stated. The act of refusing to bear arms was a public demonstration that could not fail to cause discussion and reflection, and subsequently raise working-class consciousness. That was why, when it was "morally and materially possible" for anarchist conscripts to leave the barracks, Monatte declared, they should depart.(81)

Other radicals were more circumspect in their advice. In 1900 Fred Pol suggested that young conscripts practice passive resistance during their time of servitude. Do the job simply, he cautioned. If you are too angered, remain

silent; direct that anger toward militarism. If things become too difficult, Pol counseled his young friends in the service, "swallow [your] spit; don't put it on the face of your commanding officer." The young soldiers must be careful, he noted, since they were "the combatants for the battle of tomorrow." (82) Gustave Hervé tendered the same advice in the 1903 edition of his Pioupiau de l'Yonne. He would never advise desertion because such an act would mean imprisonment for the conscript. Then the Socialist Party would be deprived of a valuable recruit. Instead, Hervé would counsel the soldier-worker to serve his time "with good humor, without letting all the drudgery fall on his neighbor." He must calmly, but indignantly, report all brutalities by his superiors to the leftist newspapers. He must discreetly and patiently propagate socialist and antimilitarist ideas. Above all, the conscript must demonstrate working-class solidarity, and if brought to a strike, fire his rifle into the air. (83)

DISSENSION WITHIN THE RANKS

Desertion was never officially linked with the antimilitarist campaign endorsed by the CGT, except insofar as it was offered in the Manuel as an acceptable alternative. But a series of events conspired to bring on a full-fledged rebellion against the continued support of antimilitarism by reformist elements in the Confederation. Although antimilitarist propaganda was adopted in 1900 as an acceptable activity, the implementation of this weapon, as with other forms of direct action, was left up to the individual to use how and when he saw fit. In the early congresses the general strike was not closely conjoined with the antimilitarist campaign. But by 1903 it was apparent that the CGT was bent on accelerating its antimilitarist activities and linking the general strike to the antimilitarist campaign.

In 1903 Yvetot wrote an article in La Voix du Peuple entitled "Syndicalisme-antimilitarisme," which was really a defense of the general strike. Unionism had evolved beyond the narrow constraints of the 1884 law; syndicalists should no longer attempt to hide its revolutionary ends. Strikes were increasing; so too was the use of the army against the workers. It was illogical, he said, to make union propaganda without making antimilitarist propaganda. Yet there were too many within the movement who sought to inhibit syndicalism's advance. Typographers and printers were opposed to a variety of syndicalist stands, Yvetot noted: the employment of women, the circulation of the Manuel, strict adherence to the 10 1/2-hour day, and the general strike. Their federations were very strong and rich, Yvetot added, but too many of their members were conservatives. (84) A few issues later metalworker Jean Latapie pointed out that the 1884 law allowed unions to defend the workers' economic interests. Well, it was in the

workers' economic interest to reveal to the world that the army supported capitalism.(85)

The following year the antimilitarists gained great propaganda mileage over the arrest, trial, and subsequent acquittal of Yvetot and Bousquet, who had been apprehended for distributing antimilitarist tracts in Troyes. They had been accused of "insulting the army and provoking disobedience," La Voix du Peuple reported on the trial. The deck had been stacked against the pair in that they were tried in the Aube, where juries allegedly were more supportive of the government's point of view. But the two had handled themselves well during the trial. To charges of inspiring disobedience among the military, the pair defended themselves by stressing the humanitarian aspects of their actions. Antimilitarist propaganda had been carried on, according to Yvetot, in order to prevent the recurrence of shootings, such as had taken place at Fourmies. Bousquet defended his penning of "Aux mères" by professing that the article's only objective had been to counsel mothers to raise their children to respect the value of human life. After five hours of deliberation the verdict rendered was "not guilty." At the news of the jury's decision, the article concluded, "A cry of 'vive le jury!' broke out from the back of the room." (86)

Apparently the reformists were not moved by this triumph or the fact that, thanks in part to Briand's brilliant defense, juries were constantly acquitting Hervé of any wrongdoing for his antimilitarist activity.(87) Rather, they were frightened by the growing specter of radicalism and militancy, which they feared would jeopardize all the gains made by unionism, and by the further fact that they were losing control of the workers' movement to the anarchist elements. At the Bourges congress in 1904, it was apparent to the reformists that syndicalism was wildly out of control. They had received a stinging defeat on the issue of proportional representation; the campaign for the eight-hour day was adopted, with May Day 1906 targeted as the last day "workers would agree to work more than eight hours"; and a commitment to undertake a vigorous campaign of antimilitarist propaganda was made.(88)

In the interim before the next congress, militancy increased. In 1906 there were 1,309 strikes, involving 438,460 strikers, with 9 1/2-million work days lost.(89) At the Amiens congress held that year, reformists were again defeated, and the Charter of Amiens, banishing politics from the official syndicalist program, was almost unanimously adopted. Less resounding a victory for the radicals was the vote on Yvetot's resolution demanding that antimilitarist and antipatriotic propaganda "become more intense and always more audacious." When the resolution came up for discussion, reformists used the antimilitarist question in an attempt to discredit the radicals. Taking the floor, Auguste Keufer declared that he was certain that no church "would presume to impose such dogma," and that none there that day, not even the anarchists, "could affirm the infallibility of

their ideas." These revolutionaries demanded strict political neutrality; yet they did not respect their own injunctions. According to the anarchists, syndicalism had "an exclusively economic role to fill." Antimilitarist and antipatriotic action was hardly in the category of economic action. Furthermore, such a stance would be "a serious obstacle" to the development of unionism. Keufer ended his argument by calling for "absolute political and philosophical neutrality" in the dissemination of "libertarian, antimilitary [and] antipatriotic" ideas. The holding of these convictions must be left up to the dictates of the individual conscience, and the spreading of such propaganda should be carried on outside the syndicalist milieu. To Keufer, antimilitarist activity was a political act aimed against the Republic. But as delegate Philippe of Lille countered, antimilitarism had nothing to do with politics or ideology: it was a practical issue--workers were tired of having bayonets used against them. After lengthy debate, the Yvetot resolution passed, but only barely, with a vote of 388 to 310, with 63 abstentions.(90)

At the Marseille congress in 1908, reformists made another sally, only to be defeated once again. The time seemed optimum for them since Griffuelhes, Yvetot, and Pouget were all in prison at Corbeil for their participation in strikes. The absence of this important troika from the Confederal Committee meant that the revolutionary element lacked its most brilliant orators. In the two weeks preceding the congress, La Voix du Peuple carried on a vigorous campaign against militarism. The special issue of September 1908 was expressly devoted to "soldiers firing on workers." It was increasingly clear, noted the editors, that "war in the exterior [was] a pretext, a trick." Soldiers were really employed by the state to defeat the working class. Was it to make war on the striking Paris electricians that our soldiers were trained, the editors demanded to know? Should workers then wage war against soldiers? The answer to the latter query was in the negative. That would play into the hands of the exploiters, who were trying to create a chasm between the army and the workers. Instead, the militants must step up their propaganda among the soldiers. The Bastille would never have been taken, the writer noted, if the French Guard had not defected. We cannot "vanquish the army--but [we can] convince them."(91)

The following issue, which appeared the week before the opening of the Marseille congress, carried another sally against the reformists, this time penned by J. S. Boudoux of L'Union des Syndicats de Meurthe-et-Moselle. The CGT's stance was correct, he noted, because antimilitarism was not just an economic question; it was an ethical one: soldiers had the moral duty "to reject the role of jaune or assassin" imposed on them. They had as much right to refuse to march against their comrades, concluded Boudoux, as the Catholic officer who had recently refused to march against Catholic strikers.

Some said that in the interest of preserving union membership, syndicalists should remain neutral, and that they had no right to attack the sentiments of those who were patriotic. What nonsense, declared Boudoux. Workers did not join unions for patriotic or political reasons. They joined because they were exploited! Would antimilitarist activity damage unionism? He doubted it would. He and his union brethren never ceased their antimilitarist propaganda, he pointed out, and they lived in a frontier province where chauvinism was very strong. Yet their membership continued to climb. That was because their comrades had eyes to see French police fraternizing with German and Belgian police during a strike. Workers in Boudoux's union were aware that patriotism was nothing more than the defense of capitalism. As such, they regarded antimilitarist activities as "the defense of the class." (92)

In the face of these arguments, and of the reality of the violent suppression of strikes by the army, the reformists' defeat at Marseille was a foregone conclusion. For the last time before the outbreak of World War I they made an unsuccessful bid to gain proportional representation. On the question of antimilitarist propaganda, the reformists fared little better. Once again typographer Louis Niel warned that if they wished to give themselves over to antimilitarist propaganda, they would "violate [the Confederation's] statutes, shred its charter, and vitiate all its work, which is exclusively professional." The task confronting syndicalism, he declared, was already too enormous. Despite Niel's entreaties, the delegates maintained their antimilitarist posture. The right to strike would be just a sham, the resolution declared, if soldiers continued to massacre workers. The commitment to general strike in the event of war, so dear to radical hearts, passed by a hefty vote of 670 to 406. (93)

At the following congress of Toulouse the ground swell in support of antimilitarism continued to grow. That year, 1910, saw the outbreak of 1,501 strikes, with 4.8 million days lost. The antimilitarist resolution at the Toulouse congress was more complicated, consisting of a two-part motion: to continue antimilitarist activity and to fund that activity with a special "Caisse du sou du soldat." This last was the resolution of Raymond Péricat. Once more Niel railed against the fact that the CGT was ceasing to be strictly professional in order to be political. Yvetot defended the position by again reminding delegates that it was in their "corporate interest" not to have soldiers replacing workers or shooting them. Bousquet took the floor to bolster Yvetot's arguments: he had been present at the May Day demonstration in Dunkerque during the time the building trades were on strike. Saber blows rained. Soldiers did not ask the workers there if they were reformists or revolutionaries: they simply charged!

By the time Péricat rose to defend his resolution, feelings were running so high that he was frequently

interrupted by noisy outbursts from the audience. Reformist Claude Liochon had asserted that antimilitarism was not a syndical question. This was nonsense: workers were united in solidarity. Every time strikers were cut down or fired upon, the pain and suffering of the victims was shared by all. The army was a nursery for jaunes, and workers must destroy that nursery. If this is to be "an epoch of bayonets," he continued, we cannot be interested in respecting legality any more than the bourgeoisie respect it. The government cared not at all for workers' liberty. When they sent young workers to the regiment, they did not first ask the young men if they were happy about being drafted. Further, Péricat concluded, members of his federation had acquitted themselves well. They had grown from 9,000 members in 1897 to nearly 100,000. When Liochon's group of typographers could boast of the same success, he counseled, they would have the right to be more critical.

On the antimilitarist resolution, the reformists were bested 430 to 900.(94) Their defeat was their swan song. By the time of the next regular congress, held in Le Havre in 1912, the reformist "threat" was no more. The nature of the antimilitarist campaign had moved away from being merely antigovernmental; now it had become more closely identified with antiwar activity, a campaign in which even the party socialists were deeply involved. Given the temper of the times, there was no way that any group of reformists could have launched a successful assault on that.

SOME CONCLUSIONS ON THE NATURE OF ANTIMILITARISM

There are some important insights to be gained into the nature of revolutionary syndicalism's perceptions and posture regarding antipatriotism and antimilitarism. The party socialists were opposed to the bourgeois state, but they carried on their revolution in the same electoral arena. To them the state was not an enemy; it was a political adversary that could be bested one vote at a time. For them, practicing their tactic of burrowing from within, the patrie and the state were unconsciously one. This was not so with the syndicalists. Workers had long associated the Republic with economic progress. When it became increasingly apparent that the Republican state had not shared its fruits with the workers, it was a natural response for the workers to regard the state as their enemy. The fatherland continued to exist; it was still identified with material well-being; but it was held captive by the bourgeoisie. The patrie had preceded the class, workers believed; it would prevail in its most consummate actuality once the enemy class was overthrown. The state would wither away, as Marx had predicted, to bring forth the patrie of the proletariat. Antipatriotism (read antistatism) was therefore regarded by syndicalists as a practical, as well as a revolutionary act.

Antimilitarism was equated with antipatriotism; not so much for the political socialists, except insofar as it meant voting in the Chamber against military expenditures. The path to revolution for them was to build the party. Overt antimilitarist activity would frighten away adherents; therefore such activity would be antirevolutionary in nature. It was not until 1912 and the realization that the Second International was impotent that the party adopted the tactic of a military strike, but only as an antiwar measure. For the revolutionary syndicalists, however, antimilitarism remained a constant tenet of unionism. But the content of the doctrine underwent a change based on the mandates of practical necessity.

Initially, antimilitarist activities were regarded as a means by which to heighten revolutionary consciousness and swell the ranks of syndicalism. Antimilitarism was directed to the task of preserving the younger generation of workers against the real enemies: the Jesuits and the agents of the bourgeois state, as well as against the morality-corrupting intangible enemies--sloth and hedonism. To the unionists, antimilitarism was a revolutionary act. It was also a practical action, not only to recruit young members, but also to effect peasant worker solidarity. Further, when tied in with the general strike, the tactic of antimilitarism proved to be a successful way to separate revolutionary from reformist goals within the CGT. As workers' militancy increased, in tandem with government repression of labor activity, the antimilitarist offensive became an even more practical act of basic human survival. Syndicalist perceptions about antipatriotism and antimilitarist ideas were shaped initially by domestic realities and organizational concerns. With the onset of war, political forces began to hold sway; then the economic definitions were no longer valid. In 1914 the patrie became France, a political entity that must be defended. For syndicalists the revolutionary struggle was no longer exclusively economic; it became political as well.

NOTES

1. Georges Dumoulin, Les syndicats français et la guerre (Paris, 1921), p. 7. Roger Picard maintains that the interest of the leaders for organizational security had decreased their "spirit of initiative and risk." The result was that their revolutionary élan had been diluted by the time of the world crisis and the syndicalist movement was unable to respond actively to mobilization and the war. Le conflit des doctrines économiques en France à la veille de la guerre (New York, 1944), p. 152.

2. Michelle Perrot, Les ouvriers en grève, France 1871-1890, 2 vols. (Paris, 1974), vol. 1, pp. 197-198.

3. Ibid., vol. 2, pp. 701-702; vol. 1, p. 178.

4. • Ibid., vol. 2, pp. 562, 701-702.
5. • Frangisque : Brunet, A mon frère l'ouvrier (Bordeaux, n.d.).
6. Perrot, Les ouvriers en grève, vol. 2, p. 443.
7. Jacques Julliard, Fernand Pelloutier et les origines du syndicalisme d'action directe (Paris, 1971), pp. 27-29.
8. Gustave Hervé, Mes crimes, ou onze ans de prison pour délits de presse (Paris, 1912), p. 3. Perhaps Hervé's commitment to "republicanism"--with its changing definition best explains his actions. Hervé was a virulent antimilitarist, but not so violent an antipatriot. His series in La Guerre Sociale against birth control has been discussed in Chapter 3 of this work. A statistical analysis had led Hervé to conclude that by 2112 there would be no Frenchmen living in France if the population continued to decline at its present rate. The French race would be committing suicide, for France would be overrun by foreigners. He called upon his readers in the name of protecting the "patrie révolutionnaire" and of "the patriotism of free-thinking socialists and internationalists" to save the race, for "après nous, le déluge!" The series appeared on the following dates: 17 June, 24 June, 1 July, 15 July, 22 July 1914.
9. Victorien Bruguier in Souvenir de l'inauguration de la nouvelle bourse du travail (Nîmes, 1893), p. 12.
10. X(e) congrès national corporatif (IV(e) de la confédération générale du travail) . . . Compte rendu des travaux du congrès (Rennes, 1898), pp. 63-64.
11. Perrot, Les ouvriers en grève, vol. 2, p. 696.
12. Ibid., vol. 2, pp. 696-698. Since the men were peasants, they had their wives with them in the strike, Perrot points out. Hence, the female mortality. The May Day 1890 demonstration is discussed later in this chapter.
13. Ibid., vol. 2, p. 698.
14. For a discussion of the antimilitarist debate in the Second International and among French socialists, see L. Graveriaux, Les discussions sur le patriotisme et le militarisme dans les congrès socialistes (Paris, 1913).
15. La Voix du Peuple, 3 Apr. 1904.
16. Paul Louis, Le syndicalisme contre l'état (Paris, 1910), p. 68.

17. Jean Taboreau, Le sophisme antipatriotique (Paris, 1912), pp. 7-8. It must be noted that Taboreau's book was intended to serve as a reply to the syndicalists' allegedly incorrect and unethical stance.

18. La Voix du Peuple, 25 Dec. 1913.

19. Graveriaux, Discussions sur le patriotisme, pp. 132-140.

20. Bourse Régional du Travail, Compte rendu du congrès régional corporatif (Auxerre, 1907), p. 8.

21. Hervé, Mes crimes, pp. 67-69.

22. La Guerre Sociale, 2 July 1905.

23. Graveriaux, Discussions sur le patriotisme, pp. 120-122; quote of Rennes delegate appears on p. 121.

24. Hervé, Mes crimes, p. 35. This was part of his "Address to Conscripts" appearing in Ploupiou de l'Yonne in 1901.

25. XVIII(e) congrès national corporatif (XII(e) de la C.G.T.) . . . Compte rendu des travaux (Le Havre, 1912), p. 2.

26. [Georges Yvetot], Nouveau manuel du soldat (Paris, 1903), pp. 3-5. The tract was written by Yvetot, but a commission of the FBT was listed as the author. This was apparently for legal reasons: the supposition that the law would take the position that if all were guilty, then none were. The court was not fooled and members of the FBT were arrested for the publication and distribution of the Manuel.

27. XVII(e) congrès national corporatif (XI(e) de la confédération) . . . Compte rendu des travaux [1910] (Toulouse, 1911), p. 191.

28. Griffuelhes quoted in Taboreau, Le sophisme antipatriotique, p. 9.

29. La Voix du Peuple, 3 March 1913.

30. Manuel, pp. 6-7.

31. La Voix du Peuple, 3 Apr. 1904.

32. Ibid., 3 Mar. 1913.

33. See IX(e) congrès de la fédération nationale des bourses du travail . . . Compte rendu des travaux du congrès (Toulouse, 1897), p. 117.

34. Jean-Jacques Becker, Le Carnet B: Les pouvoirs publics et l'antimilitarisme avant la guerre de 1914 (Paris, 1973), pp. 13-14.

35. The information on the church's activities was expressed by delegates of the CGT congresses. Also in *ibid.*, p. 23.

36. Gravereaux, Discussions sur le patriotisme, p. 120.

37. XI(e) congrès national corporatif (V(e) de la confédération générale du travail) . . . (Paris, 1900), pp. 84-87.

38. Robert Brécy, Le mouvement syndical en France 1871-1921: Essai bibliographique (Paris, 1963), p. 58.

39. Gravereaux, Discussions sur le patriotisme, p. 122.

40. La Voix du Peuple, 9 Nov. 1902.

41. *Ibid.*, 13 Apr. 1902.

42. *Ibid.*, 20 Apr. 1902.

43. *Ibid.*, 31 Jan. 1904.

44. Jouhaux's resolution at the 1910 Toulouse congress of the CGT in Gravereaux, Discussions sur le patriotisme, p. 141.

45. XVIII(e) congrès [Le Havre, 1912], p. 189; discussion also noted on pp. 71-73.

46. Gravereaux, Discussions sur le patriotisme, p. 120.

47. XVIII(e) congrès [Le Havre, 1912], p. 186.

48. La Voix du Peuple, Jan. 1904. This was a special military issue.

49. Manuel, pp. 10-14. One can only ponder the ramifications of these numerous testimonials concerning the degeneracy of army veterans, particularly in a nation that had universal conscription, and particularly, as Jean-Jacques Becker notes, where so many workers were themselves former soldiers. Le Carnet B, p. 176.

50. XI(e) congrès [Paris, 1900] p. 84. The cost of the military was extremely high. Yvetot calculated that the military budget of one billion francs annually could provide 5,000 francs to each family in France for one year. Manuel, p. 17.

51. La Voix du Peuple, Jan. 1904 (military issue).
52. Yvetot in Manuel, pp. 7-8.
53. XVIII(e) congrès [Le Havre, 1912], p. 186.
54. La Voix du Peuple, Jan. 1903 (military issue).
55. Hervé, Mes crimes, pp. 92-95.
56. La Voix du Peuple, Jan. 1902 (military issue).
57. *Ibid.*, Jan. 1904 (military issue).
58. *Ibid.*, Feb. 1909 (military issue).
59. For statistics see Gravereaux, Discussions sur le patriotisme, p. 124. Report appears in Confédération Générale du Travail, Rapports des comités et des commissions pour l'exercice 1904-1906 (Paris, 1906), p. 51. See Becker, Le Carnet B, pp. 69-71.
60. La Voix du Peuple, 20 Apr. 1902.
61. Manuel, p. 32.
62. La Voix du Peuple, 21 Sept. 1912.
63. Becker, Le Carnet B, p. 27.
64. La Voix du Peuple, 20 Apr. 1902.
65. Rapports des comités [Amiens, 1906], p. 50.
66. La Voix du Peuple, 18 Mar. 1914.
67. XVII(e) congrès [Toulouse, 1910], p. 194.
68. XVIII(e) congrès [Le Havre, 1912], p. 186.
69. Maurice Dommanget, Histoire du Premier Mai (Paris, 1953), pp. 122-124.
70. Le Libertaire, 19 Aug. 1900. In 1906 Grandidier, Hervé, Almeréyda, and Yvetot were given prison sentences for their participation in antimilitarist activities. Announced in *ibid.*, 6 Jan. 1906.
71. XI(e) congrès [Paris, 1900], p. 83.
72. *Ibid.* La Voix du Peuple, 1 Dec. 1901, recorded another similar example. At a strike in Le Havre, four soldiers of the 129th regiment, speaking in the name of 704 of their comrades, declared they would raise their rifles in

the air rather than fire.

73. Gravereaux, Discussions sur le patriotisme, p. 118.
74. Manuel, p. 32.
75. Le Libertaire, 21 Oct. 1900.
76. Dommanget, Histoire du Premier Mai, p. 223.
77. *Ibid.*, pp. 206-219 for discussion of the eight-hour campaign.
78. Confédération Générale du Travail, La confédération générale du travail et le mouvement syndical (Paris, 1925), p. 102. Hereafter cited as La CGT et le mouvement syndical. See also Becker, Le Carnet B, p. 25.
79. Reported in La CGT et le mouvement syndical, p. 82.
80. Manuel, pp. 29-30.
81. Le Libertaire, 11 Oct. 1902.
82. *Ibid.*, 21 Oct. 1900.
83. Hervé, Mes crimes, pp. 38-42.
84. La Voix du Peuple, 4 Jan. 1903.
85. *Ibid.*, Jan. 1903 military issue.
86. *Ibid.*, 31 Jan. 1904.
87. For a time Hervé was able to escape prison not only because of Briand's "magistral" pleading in his behalf, but also because he was always being tried before republican juries in the Yonne, a region that was saturated with his doctrines. Hervé, Mes crimes, p. 37. Hervé was dismissed from his professorship at the Lycée de Sens, however.
88. Brécy, Le mouvement syndical, p. 62.
89. Roger Picard, Le mouvement syndical durant la guerre (Paris, 1928), p. 41.
90. XV(e) congrès national corporatif (IX(e) de la confédération) . . . Compte rendu des travaux (Amiens, 1906), pp. 156-175. Quotes appear on pp. 156, 157, 174. The vote recorded in the proceedings of the congress is listed here. It conflicts with Brécy's tally in Le mouvement syndical. He records it as being 484 to 300. (P. 65.)

91. Ibid., p. 69 for data on the imprisonment of the militants. Quote appears in La Voix du Peuple, Sept. 1908 (military issue).

92. La Voix du Peuple, 27 Sept. 1908.

93. For statistics see Brécy, Le mouvement syndical, p. 69. For the resolutions see, La CGT et le mouvement syndical, pp. 102-104. For Niel's remark see Graveraux, Discussions sur le patriotisme, pp. 132-133.

94. See Picard, Le mouvement syndical, p. 41 for statistics. For discussion, see XVII(e) congrès [Toulouse, 1910], pp. 191-193, 225, 227.

PERSONS CITED

Boudoux, J. E. (1881-1936), born at Saint-Etienne; real name Jean Sellenet. Married; a forger by profession. He deserted the army in 1904 and hid under his assumed name of Boudoux. The following year he was involved in strikes in Lunéville and Longwy. That year he was arrested for his desertion, then amnestied. Thereafter, he was involved in numerous strikes and antimilitarist demonstrations, for which he finally served a prison term. After prison, he became an officer in a union of workers in the Meurthe-et-Moselle. He contributed to working-class publications and assisted at CGT congresses. He was expelled from the Confederation later on charges that he was a police spy. He was mobilized during the war and earned the Croix de guerre for saving his commander's life. At war's end, he continued his militancy. He worked on Le Libertaire, and joined the CGTU. In 1936 he was killed in Spain fighting against Franco.

Bruguier, Victorien (1858-1944), a tailor by profession, he founded the Nîmes bourse and was an officer in the Clothing Workers' Federation. He was involved in the FBT, and was elected as a socialist to the Nîmes Municipal Council. Interested in public education, Bruguier worked for free public education for children, construction of bourses, and vocational training for workers. He was married and the father of two sons.

Liochon, Claude (1880-1941), born and died in the Seine-et-Oise. He was a typographer who joined the reformist wing of the CGT after his military service. He attended numerous CGT congresses and was opposed to the Confederation's antimilitarist line. He was mobilized in 1914, wounded, and returned to civilian life profoundly pacifistic. He succeeded Keufer in 1919 as head of the Fédération du Livre, leaving the Socialist Party out of respect for syndicalism's stand on political activism. His penchant for peace later inclined him toward collaboration

with Vichy.

Monatte, Pierre (1881-1960), born in the Haute-Loire, died in Paris. His father managed a blacksmith shop, his mother was a lacemaker. Monatte received his bachelor's degree and taught in the Nord. During this period he became involved with militant syndicalists and anarchists, and was subsequently fired for his political activities. He migrated to Paris, founded a union of librarians, and became a proofreader, a profession he would exercise until 1952. He was arrested and imprisoned in 1905 for his union activity. In 1908 he fled to Switzerland to escape arrest as one of those involved in the strike at Villeneuve-Saint-Georges. On his return to Paris, Monatte worked as a librarian for the CGT, until he opened his own journal, La Vie Ouvrière, although the paper was always in debt. He opposed the Union sacrée, and was critical of the CGT majority. He supported the Third International.

Péricat, Raymond (1873-1957), born in the Seine-et-Marne. He was a plasterworker, involved in his first strike in 1888. After his military service, he became a secretary in the Building Workers' Federation. He went into exile for a time after being involved in demonstrations in Draveil in 1908. Upon his return, Péricat joined the SFIO, and spent the next few years traveling throughout France participating in strikes, demonstrations, and workers' meetings. He was in charge of propaganda in Algeria for the CGT after 1912. It was on his inspiration that the CGT initiated the Sou du soldat. On 31 July 1914 he called for a general strike, and was the only one on the Confederal Committee to do so.

Philippe (?-?), represented a union of employees of commerce from Lille at the 1906 CGT congress. He believed that political and economic activity should be carried on by the workers.

Sémanaz, Jean-Baptiste (1874-1914), born at Lyon, died in the Nord. At fifteen, he joined a union of municipal workers. In 1900 he attended both the socialist and the CGT congresses as a representative of sewer workers. He was elected mayor of Le Pré-Saint-Gervais. Sémanaz was gravely wounded at the Somme and died en route to the hospital.